IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 83 OF 2006

Ganpat Andrade Adkonkar
and others. ... Petitioners

versus

State of Goa through the
Chief Secretary and others. ... Respondents

Mr. Rohit Bras De Sa, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. S. R. Rivonkar, Government Advocate for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

CORAM : A. P. LAVANDE &
N. A. BRITTO, JJ.

DATE : 13TH MARCH, 2006.

P.C.:-

Heard Mr. Rohit Bras De Sa, learned Counsel for the petitioners and Mr. S. R. Rivonkar, learned Government Advocate for the respondents.

The petitioners have filed an application under Section 7 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Agricultural Tenancy Act, 1964(hereinafter referred to as the Act) before the respondent no.3. Along with their application they have filed application

seeking interim relief under Section 8-A of the Act.

It is the contention of the petitioners that the application for interim relief is not being decided by respondent no.3 inspite of the fact that the petitioners moved the respondent no.3 for ex parte relief. Without going into the controversy, in the interest of justice, we direct respondent no.3 to decide the application for interim relief filed under Section 8-A of the said Act within a period of four weeks after the opponents in the said case No.TNC/JM-I/Decl/Bamb/05/06 are served. Till the application is disposed of by respondent no.3, the opponent in the said case shall not cut any trees except those which are permitted to be cut by the competent authority.

Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Parties to act on the duly authenticated copy of the order.

A. P. LAVANDE, J.

N. A. BRITTO, J.

RD